UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Michael Burnett,

COURT FILE NO.: 0:13-cv-01933-ADM-JJK

Plaintiff,

v.

JOINT ANSWER DEFENDANTS

JURY TRIAL REQUESTED

City of Minneapolis; Christopher Cushenbery, Badge No. 1375, personally, and in his capacity as a Minneapolis Police Officer; Laurarose Turner, Badge No. 007340, personally, and in her capacity as a Minneapolis Police Officer; Steven D. Lecy, Badge No. 004057, personally, and his capacity as a Minneapolis Police Officer; John Doe and Jane Doe each personally and his or her capacity as a Minneapolis Police Officer,

Defendants.

Defendants, fort their Answer to Plaintiff/s Complaint, state and allege as follows:

Unless admitted, qualified, or otherwise pleaded below, Defendants deny each and every allegation, matter and thing in Plaintiffs' Complaint.

Defendants:

- 1. Admit that this is an action for money damages for alleged injuries sustained by Plaintiff; deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 1.
 - 2. Admit the allegations in paragraph 2.
 - 3. Admit, upon information and belief, the allegations in paragraph 3.

- 4. Admit that Officer Cushenbery is a U.S. citizen, Minnesota resident, Caucasian and Minneapolis police officer with badge No. 1375 and was acting as a police officer at the time of the incident; deny that he was driving Squad 361A.
- 5. Admit that Officer Lecy is a U.S. citizen, Minnesota resident, Caucasian and Minneapolis police officer with badge No. 7340 and was acting as a police officer at the time of the incident; deny that he was assigned to Squad 331.
 - 6. Admit the allegations in paragraph 6.
- 7. The allegations in paragraph 7 are not susceptible to responsive pleading and are, therefore, denied.
- 8. The allegations in paragraph 8 are not susceptible to responsive pleading and are, therefore, denied.
- 9. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 9 and they are, therefore, denied.
- 10. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 9 and they are, therefore, denied.
- 11. Admit that on January 1, 2010, at approximately 4:00 a.m. Minneapolis Police Officers knocked on the front door of the residence; Defendants are without knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the remaining allegations in paragraph 11 and they are, therefore, denied.
- 12. Admit that officers were responding to a call concerning shots being fired and had previously responded to a fight call.

- 13. Admit the door was inside a small porch; admit that a female came to the door, but did not open the door; admit that the Plaintiff opened the door; deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 13.
- 14. Admit that Plaintiff opened the door; defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the location of the Plaintiff's mother; deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 14.
- 15. Admit that Officer Lecy was the Officer who knocked on and was standing at the front door when it opened as alleged in paragraph 15.
 - 16. Deny the allegations in paragraph 16.
- 17. Admit that Officer Lecy used force against the Plaintiff; deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 17.
- 18. Admit that officers attempted to pull the Plaintiff into the porch; admit that officers used force; deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 18.
- 19. Admit that Officer Lecy deployed his taser; admit that one taser dart missed the Plaintiff and struck Officer Cushenberry; admit that the taser was used in the drive stun mode three times; deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 19.
- 20. Admit that Officer Turner stationed herself in the doorway to the house to keep people from inside the residence from joining in fracas; deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 20.
- 21. Admit that Officers Lecy and Cushenberry continued to use force until the Plaintiff was under control in placed into handcuffs; admit that the force used included closed fist strikes and knee strikes; deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 21.

- 22. Admit, upon information and belief, that Officer Cushenberry stuck the Plaintiff in the right cheek, the back of the head and delivered four knee strikes; deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 22.
- 23. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained in paragraph 23 and they are, therefore, denied.
- 24. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to what John Wiley witnessed. Defendants deny that John Wiley witnessed any Officer smashing the butt of a flashlight into Burnett's eye. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 24.
- 25. Admit that other officers arrived at the scene; deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 25.
- 26. Admit that when the Plaintiff was under control he was taken down the steps and placed on his stomach on the sidewalk; deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 26.
 - 27. Deny the allegations in paragraph 27.
 - 28. Deny the allegations in paragraph 28.
 - 29. Deny the allegations in paragraph 29.
- 30. Admit that Officer Lecy spoke to women leaving the address who said that no shots had been fired; deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 30.
- 31. Admit that the Plaintiff was taken to the Hennepin County Medical Center, treated for injuries; booked into the Hennepin County Jail and later tab charged with

disorderly conduct and obstructing legal process; deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 31.

- 32. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in paragraph 32 and they are, therefore, denied.
 - 33. Deny the allegations in paragraph 33.
 - 34. Deny the allegations in paragraph 34.
 - 35. Deny the allegations in paragraph 35.

CAUSES OF ACTION

COUNT ONE

42 U.S.C. § 1983 – FOURTH AMENDMENT VIOLATIONS (EXCESSIVE USE OF FORCE AND UNREASONABLE SEIZURE) (DEFENDANTS CUSHENBERY AND LECY)

- 36. The allegations set forth in paragraph 36 are not susceptible to responsive pleading and are, therefore, denied.
 - 37. Deny the allegations in paragraph 37.
 - 38. Deny the allegations in paragraph 38.
 - 39. Deny the allegations in paragraph 39.
 - 40. Deny the allegations in paragraph 40.
 - 41. Deny the allegations in paragraph 41.

COUNT TWO

42 U.S.C. § 1983 – FOURTH AMENDMENT VIOLATIONS (CONSPIRACY IN EXCESSIVE USE OF FORCE AND UNREASONABLE SEIZURE) (DEFENDANTS CUSHENBERY, LECY, TURNER, JOHN DOE AND JANE DOE)

- 42. The allegations set forth in paragraph 42 are not susceptible to responsive
 - 43. Deny the allegations in paragraph 43.

pleading and are, therefore, denied.

- 44. Deny the allegations in paragraph 44.
- 45. Deny the allegations in paragraph 45.
- 46. Deny the allegations in paragraph 46.
- 47. Deny the allegations in paragraph 47.
- 48. Deny the allegations in paragraph 48.

COUNT THREE

42 U.S.C. § 1985

- 49. The allegations set forth in paragraph 49 are not susceptible to responsive pleading and are, therefore, denied.
 - 50. Deny the allegations in paragraph 50.
 - 51. Deny the allegations in paragraph 51.
 - 52. Deny the allegations in paragraph 52.
 - 53. Deny the allegations in paragraph 53.

COUNT FOUR

CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATION BY CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS – MONELL CLAIM

- 1. The allegations set forth in the second paragraph 1 are not susceptible to responsive pleading and are, therefore, denied.
 - 2. Deny the allegations in the second paragraph 2.
 - 3. Deny the allegations in the second paragraph 3.
 - 4. Deny the allegations in the second paragraph 4.
 - 5. Deny the allegations in the second paragraph 5.
 - 6. Deny the allegations in the second paragraph 6.
 - 7. Deny the allegations in the second paragraph 7.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

- 1. The Complaint fails to state a claim against Defendants upon which relief can be granted.
- 2. Defendants allege that the acts upon which the Complaint is made were privileged, were commanded or authorized by law, and were done in a reasonable and lawful manner under the circumstances, such that Defendants are immune from liability in this action.
- 3. The use of force, if any, was privileged under the common law and/or under Minn. Stat. § 609.06.
- 4. At all times material to the Complaint, Defendant City of Minneapolis' employees were entitled to qualified immunity from liability in this action.

- 5. Plaintiff's injuries and damages, if any were caused, contributed to, or brought about by Plaintiff's own negligence and Defendants are not legally responsible.
- 6. Plaintiff's damages, if any, were caused, contributed to, or brought about by Plaintiff's unlawful and illegal acts and/or the unlawful and illegal acts of those over whom Defendant exercises no right of control.
- 7. Defendants specifically deny that Plaintiff has any right to attorney's fees in this action.
- 8. Defendant City of Minneapolis is immune from liability for punitive damages.
- 9. Plaintiff has failed to take reasonable action to avoid or mitigate the alleged detriment or damages.
- 10. Defendant City of Minneapolis alleges that the City of Minneapolis is a municipality, and therefore said Defendant is immune from liability for claims pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, which are based upon the concept of *respondent superior*.
- 11. Individual Defendants have not been properly served with a summons and complaint in this action.
- 12. Defendants allege affirmatively that the acts upon which the Complaint is made were privileged, were based upon probable cause to believe the Plaintiff committed a criminal offense, were commanded or authorized by law, and were done in a reasonable and lawful manner under the circumstances, such that Defendants are immune from liability in this action.

- The policies and procedures used by Defendants with regard to the Plaintiff 13. are both fair in form and operation.
- Defendants' decisions regarding Plaintiff were based upon 14. nondiscriminatory, legitimate and common reasons.

Dated: July 18, 2013 SUSAN L. SEGAL

City Attorney

By

s/Timothy S. Skarda

TIMOTHY S. SKARDA (#10176X) ANDREA KLOEHN NAEF (#0386497)

Assistant City Attorneys Attorneys for Defendants 350 South 5th Street, Room 210 Minneapolis, MN 55415

(612) 673-2553